

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1, 3-13, 16-29, 38 and 42-43 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 2, 14-15, 30-37, 39-41 and 44 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 3-13, 16-29, 38 and 40-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable in view of a combination of references to Megeid, Dimitrova et al., Allen et al., Mitchell, Lilleness et al. and Knowles et al. The rejection of claims 40-41 and 44 is moot due to the cancellation of these claims. It is respectfully submitted that the remaining claims are now patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, has been amended to include features of claim 40 which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

... a receiver configured to receive encoded MPEG data, still image data and text data from the device to be controlled ...

... a display configured to **simultaneously** display (i) information contents of the decoded MPEG data as a motion picture, (ii) the still image data as a still image and (iii) the text data as text.

The Official Action admits that Megeid and Dimitrova et al. do not disclose **simultaneously** displaying motion picture, still image data and text data. (Page 9, lines 30-32). The Official action argues, however, that Mitchell discloses these features. (Page 9, last 2 lines to page 10, line 2).

Mitchell only discloses that the STB 102 may be configured to send background info (text), pictures (image) and video previews (motion picture) to the remote control 204. (Para. [0042]). Mitchell does not, however, disclose how the sent information is

displayed. Mitchell does not, therefore, disclose simultaneously displaying the different types of data on the remote control display. Thus, Mitchell does not disclose "... a display configured to simultaneously display (i) information contents of the decoded MPEG data as motion picture data, (ii) still image data and (iii) text data," as recited in claim 1.

The remote controller 130 of Applicants' exemplary embodiment includes a display 16. As shown at Fig. 15, the display 16 may include a motion picture window 64, a text window 66 and a still image window 67. (Page 17, lines 2-8 and Fig. 15). That is, the display 16 simultaneously displays motion picture data at window 64, text data at text window 66 and still image data at still image window 67. Thus, Applicants' exemplary embodiment discloses "... a display configured to simultaneously display (i) information contents of the decoded MPEG data as a motion picture, (ii) the still image data as a still image and (iii) the text data as text," as recited in claim 1. Applicants' claimed features are advantageous over the prior art because more information can be displayed on the display of the remote control and not the television screen. Thus, viewers will not be distracted from viewing information that is currently displayed on the television screen.

Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 3-13, 16-29, and 42 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-13, 16-29, and 42 are also allowable over the art of record.


Claim 38, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 38 is also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claim 43 depends from claim 38. Accordingly, claim 43 is also allowable over the art of record.

Application No.: 10/775,867  
Amendment Dated: August 12, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of: June 9, 2008

MAT-8505US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515  
Attorney for Applicants

DFD/dfd/fp

Dated: August 12, 2008

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

NM297421